

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION**ENTERED**

November 26, 2024

Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

v.

EITHAN HAIM

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Criminal Action No. 24-CR-00298

ORDER

Pending before the Court are Non-Party Not The Bee, LLC's Motions to Intervene and Unseal (Document No. 117) and Motions to Appear Pro Hac Vice (Document Nos. 120–122). Having considered the motions, submissions, and applicable law, the Court determines that Non-Party Not The Bee, LLC's motions to intervene, unseal, and appear pro hac vice should be denied. Notwithstanding the Non-Party motions, the Court has independently reviewed the sealed filings by the Government. The Government does not oppose the unsealing of Document No. 101 and Document No. 104, but objects to the unsealing of Document No. 107 and Document No. 108. Having considered the nature of the sealed documents and the applicable law, the Court determines that in the interest of judicial transparency, Document No. 101, Document No. 104, Document No. 107, and Document No. 108 should now be unsealed. Accordingly, the Court hereby

ORDERS that Non-Party Not The Bee, LLC's Motion to Intervene and Unseal (Document No. 117) is **DENIED**. The Court further

ORDERS that Non-Party Not The Bee, LLC's Motion to Appear Pro Hac Vice for Krista L. Baughman (Document No. 120) is **DENIED**. The Court further

ORDERS that Non-Party Not The Bee, LLC's Motion to Appear Pro Hac Vice for Harmeet K. Dhillon (Document No. 121) is **DENIED**. The Court further

ORDERS that Non-Party Not The Bee, LLC's Motion to Appear Pro Hac Vice for Jesse Franklin-Murdock (Document No. 122) is **DENIED**. The Court further


ORDERS that Document No. 101 is **UNSEALED**. The Court further

ORDERS that Document No. 104 is **UNSEALED**. The Court further

ORDERS that Document No. 107 is **UNSEALED**.¹ The Court further

ORDERS that Document No. 108 is **UNSEALED**.²

SIGNED at Houston, Texas, on this 26 day of November, 2024.



DAVID HITTNER

United States District Judge

¹ The Court has considered the Government's objections to the unsealing of Document No. 107 and finds that the need for judicial transparency outweighs the potential prejudice caused by unsealing the aforementioned document based on its presence already in the public sphere.

² The Court has considered the Government's objections to the unsealing of Document No. 108 and finds that the need for judicial transparency outweighs the potential prejudice caused by unsealing the aforementioned document based on its presence already in the public sphere.